

GLM:ash 6/20/06 534432.doc E-272-1999/O-US-03
PATENTAttorney Reference Number 4239-62295-01
Application Number 10/088,269**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks. Claims 1-5, 9-40 and 64-68 are pending in the application. Claims 15-40 have been withdrawn from consideration. No claims have been allowed. Claims 1, 64 and 68 are independent.

Procedural Posture

A final Action was mailed September 26, 2005. Applicants responded with amendments on January 26, 2006. The amendments were entered, but the Advisory Action of February 28, 2006, maintained the rejection of claims 1-5, 9-14, and 64-68 under § 103. Applicants filed a Request for Continued Examination and now present additional amendments.

Applicants reiterate the position presented in the response of January 26, 2006, but now present additional amendments to expedite issuance of a patent covering the technology.

Cited Art

U.S. Pat. No. 5,817,462 to Garini et al. ("Garini").

U.S. Pat. No. 5,784,162 to Cabib et al. ("Cabib").

Interview Summary

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for his time during a telephonic interview on Monday, June 19, 2006. Applicants' attorney discussed claim 1 and Garini. No agreement was reached regarding the claims.

Patentability of Claims 1-5, 9-14, and 64-68 over Garini and Cabib under § 103

The Advisory Action rejects claims 1-5, 9-14, and 64-68 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Garini in light of Cabib. Applicants respectfully submit the claims in their present form are allowable over the cited art. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of

Interview Summary
OKAY
EOT 09/30/2006